

Atty Docket No. 166.0001



PATENT

Best Available Copy

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re application of:

ROACH ET AL.

Group Art Unit: 2172

Serial No.: 09/957,459

Filed: September 21, 2001

Examiner: B. To

For: AN AUTOMATIC REAL-TIME FILE MANAGEMENT METHOD AND APPARATUS

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL

Frederick N. Samuels, Esquire
Reg. 34,715
CAHN & SAMUELS, LLP
2000 P Street, N.W., Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 331-8777 (Telephone)
(202) 331-3838 (Facsimile)
Attorney for Appellants

07/11/2006 JADD01 00000012 09957459

01 FC:2402

250.00 OP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Real Party In Interest	3
2. Related Appeals	3
3. Status of Claims.....	3
4. Status of Amendments.....	3
5. Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter	3
6. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	3
7. Argument.....	4
a. Rejections (a) – (d).....	4
b. The Rejection of Claims 1-3, 9-12, 15 and 54-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).....	6
c. The Rejection of claims 34-38, 43-51 and 57-59	10
i. Claim 44	11
d. The Rejection of claims 4-8 and 13-14	12
i. The Rejection of Claims 39-42	12
ii. Claims 39 and 40	13
e. Claims 41 and 42	13

APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL

1. Real Party In Interest

Applicant is the real party in interest.

2. Related Appeals

None.

3. Status of Claims

(1) Claims 1, 3-24 and 27-36 are currently pending in this application and stand rejected. Claims 2 and 37 are cancelled. Claims 25 and 26 are pending but have not been examined.

4. Status of Amendments

A Pre- Appeal Brief Request for Review was filed on February 7, 2006. In a decision dated March 9, 2006, the case was passed to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

5. Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter

6. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

(a) The rejection of claims 1-3, 9-12, 15 and 54-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,629,109 B1 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,638,509.

(b) The rejection of claims 34-38, 43-51 and 57-59 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,638,509 further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,629,109 B1.

(c) The rejection of claims 4-8 and 13-14 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No.

6,629,109 B1 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,638,509.

(d) The rejection of claims 39-42 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,638,509 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,629,109 B1 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,608,865

7. Argument

a. Rejections (a) – (d)

A claimed invention is unpatentable for obviousness if the differences between it and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art. *In re Zurko*, 258 F.3d 1379, 1383 (Fed. Cir. 2001). Obviousness is a legal question based on underlying factual determinations including 1) the scope and content of the prior art, 2) the level of ordinary skill in the art, 3) the differences between the prior art and the claimed invention and 4) objective evidence of secondary considerations. Here the Official Action has erred in its factual assessment of points 1, 3 and 4 and, therefore, the rejections of all pending claims must be reversed. *Id* at 1386.

The Official Action made an incorrect factual finding that the claim term "operating system" was equivalent to the API of Koshisaka. The Official Action improperly relied upon this factual finding as a basis for its obviousness conclusions in all of the rejections. The Office Action fundamentally misconstrued the scope and meaning of the term API as used in Koshisaka. The record evidence, including Koshisaka, Dunphy, The Webster's New World Dictionary of Computer Terms¹, compel the conclusion that Koshisaka's API is not equivalent to the claimed operating system.

¹ Attached as Exhibit 1 to the Evidence Appendix.

Koshisaka itself clearly distinguishes between operating systems and application programs. See elements 1 and 3 of Figure 1. More particularly, Koshisaka defines Application (from which API commands emanate) as generally used application software such as word processor software, spreadsheet software, CAD software, etc. In contrast, Koshisaka defines operating system as software for operating the computer system, such as Windows 98.

Further in support of Applicants' position, one of the other cited references, Dunphy, discloses an operating system 19 that is separate and distinct from application programs 8. See Column 3, lines 36-47 and Figure 1.

Moreover, applicable technical dictionaries recognize the difference between APIs and operating systems. The Webster's New World Dictionary of Computer Terms defines "API" as a set of standards or conventions by which programs can call specific operating system or network services. The same dictionary defines the plain meaning of "Operating System" as a master control program that manages the computer's internal functions, such as accepting keyboard input, and that provides a means to control the computer's operations and file system. See pages 33 and 338 of Exhibit 1.

In contrast, not a shred of evidence supports the Office Action's position that Koshisaka's API and the claimed operating system are the same. Because the Office Action's conclusion of obviousness in each rejection was based on this erroneous assessment of the scope of the prior art, all of the rejections lack substantial evidence support and, for this reason alone, must be reversed. Zurko 1386.

There is a second fundamental error in the Office Action that at least requires that the application be remanded to the Examiner for further consideration. The Office

Action contains no cogent discussion of the §1.132 Declaration of Steve Williams².

With regard to the Declaration, the Office Action states as follows:

"The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 09/07/2004 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-18 and 34-59 based upon rejection of 1-3 (a) as set forth in the last Office action because: although factual evidence is preferable to opinion testimony, such testimony is entitle to consideration and some weight so long as the opinion testimony is not on the ultimate legal conclusion at issue. While an opinion as to a legal conclusion is not entitle to any weight, the underlying basic for the opinion as to a legal conclusion is not entitled to any weight , the underlying basic for the opinion may be persuasive. In re Chilowsky, 306 F.2d 908, 134 USPQ 515 (CCPA 1962) (expert opinion that an application meets the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112 is not entitled to any weight; however, facts supporting a basic for deciding that the specification complies with 35 U.S.C. 112 are entitle to some weight. Although an affiant's or declarant's opinion on the ultimate legal issue is not evident in the case, "some weight ought to be given to persuasively supported statement of on ordinary skill in art on what was not obvious to him."

Office Action at page 2. The foregoing description offers no explanation as to why the Declaration is insufficient. Curiously, the discussion addresses declarations offered to show compliance with 35 USC 112. The instant Declaration was not offered for that purpose. Rather, it was offered to show what the Koshisaka teaches to a person having ordinary skill. In short, the Office Action must provide a written explanation as to why the Declaration is unpersuasive and does not overcome the rejection. Absent any such description all of the rejections must be reversed. *Ex Parte Mitchell*, 2001 Pat. App. LEXIS 66³.

b. The Rejection of Claims 1-3, 9-12, 15 and 54-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Turning now to the individual rejections, the Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 9-12, 15 and 54-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Koshisaka in view of

² The Declaration is attached as Exhibit 2 to the Evidence Appendix.

³ A copy of this decision is attached.

Dunphy. This rejection is improper for the reasons set forth above as well as the following. The proposed combination of Koshisaka/Dunphy does not address all of the limitations of the claims. For the purpose of this discussion, claim 1 is representative of claims 2-3, 9-12, 15 and 54-57. Claim 1 is directed to a method for archiving files and recites “detecting an instruction by an operating system to perform an operation on an operating file”. Notwithstanding the comments to the contrary in the Office Action, neither Koshisaka nor Dunphy, taken alone or in combination, teach or disclose this detecting step.

As mentioned above, the Office Action errs in equating Koshisaka’s API with the operating system of the claims. The term “operating system” is defined in the instant specification at paragraph 28 as:

“A computer program that allocates system resources such as memory, disk space, and processor usage and makes it possible for the computer to boot up to a human user interface allowing the user to interact with the computer and control its operation”.

Where an explicit definition is provided by the applicant for a term, that definition will control interpretation of the term as it is used in the claim. *Toro Co. v. White Consolidated Industries Inc.*, 199 F.3d 1295, 1301, 53 USPQ2d 1065, 1069 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Here, this axiom is particularly applicable as the definition of the term “operating system” set forth in the specification parallels the plain meaning of the term as evidenced by Exhibit 1 and the understanding of the skilled artisan as evidenced by Koshisaka and Dunphy.

Koshisaka, teaches “an application-centric” file revision management system and method by which file revision management allegedly can be implemented even if applications are not provided with file revision management functions. Koshisaka

teaches the use of an Applications Programming Interface (API) layer to be placed between an application and an operating system. According to Koshisaka, file backup reliability of the applications can be improved by this file revision management system. See Koshisaka, column 1, lines 57-63. See also Exhibit 4, Paragraph 5. A file manipulation monitoring section in Koshisaka first detects file manipulation (e.g., file deletion or file name change) that is to be executed by the application by intercepting these instructions as they are generated by the application. See Exhibit 4, Paragraph 6. Koshisaka specifically states, “the file manipulation monitoring section constantly monitors API (Application Program Interface) commands which are outputted by the application 1 to the operating system and thereby detects the file manipulation which is (going to be) executed by the application 1.” See Koshisaka, column 6, lines 34-38.

The method of the present invention, as defined by claims 1 and 54, is a “data-centric” approach to file archiving, not an application-centric approach. This distinction is evidenced by the claim limitations of, “detecting an instruction **by an operating system** to perform an operation on an operating file,” and “capturing the operating file temporally proximate to the operation being performed on the operating file, responsive to the detection of the instruction.”

In direct contrast, Koshisaka is not data-centric; that is, it does not teach detection of an instruction by an operating system. Rather, the detected **instruction** or command in Koshisaka is **the API command** that is generated **by the application**, not **the operating system**. See Exhibit 4, Paragraphs 5, 6 and 7. For example, in Koshisaka, when an API command requesting file deletion is output by the application, the command is detected and hooked by the file manipulation monitoring section in the

file management system 2. Subsequently, the processing section sends a different API command to the operating system. In other words, the instruction is first detected by the API and hooked. After the instruction is hooked, a different instruction is passed to the operating system, and the original command sent by the API to the operating system is not executed during performance of Koshisaka's revision management system activities. See Williams declaration, Paragraph 5.

As a result of detecting the instruction *by the application*, unlike the present invention, it is believed that Koshisaka provides a very limited layer of file protection, as file protection occurs only if the application is compatible with Koshisaka's assumptions of API behavior. See, Koshisaka, column 7, lines 59-64. See also Exhibit 4, Paragraph 8. However, because the invention as defined by claim 1 is captures files based on operating system instructions, it achieves file protection of intended file change operations as well as file changes that result from some type of file corruption.

Dunphy is directed to a data storage and protection device used for data backup. Dunphy, like Koshisaka, teaches an application-centric solution. As illustrated in Figure 1, Dunphy depicts an operating system 19, application programs 8 and file system 9. Data file monitor 11 is interposed between application programs 8 and file system 9. Data file monitor 11 intercepts communications between *application programs 8 and file system 9*. Data file monitor 11 reviews the communication to determine whether it relates to a data file that the user has selected for monitoring. If the data file is one to be monitored, it is determined whether the communication results in a change in content of a data file. If data file change is detected, data file monitor 11 extracts data file status and activity information from the received communications and

uses this data to build an event log 12. Data file monitor 11 also determines whether the communication requests an operation that changes the contents of the data file, i.e., would cause a loss of data. If so, then the data file is saved. See Dunphy, Column 3 line 49 to column 4, line 21.

Unlike the method of claim 1, Dunphy does not detect an instruction *by an operating system*. Thus, Dunphy suffers from the same deficiencies as Koshisaka.

Since the combination of Koshisaka and Dunphy does not address all claim limitations, the rejection of claims 1-3, 9-12, 15 and 54-57 must be reversed.

c. The Rejection of claims 34-38, 43-51 and 57-59

The Office Action rejected claims 34-38, 43-51 and 57-59 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Dunphy in view of Koshisaka. This rejection is improper for the reasons set forth above as well as the following. The proposed combination of Dunphy/Koshisaka does not address all of the limitations of the rejected claims.

Claim 34 is directed to a method for archiving files including the steps of detecting an instruction by an operating system to perform an operation on an operating file and creating an archive file from the operating file and storing the archive file in a temporary storage location temporally proximate to the operation being performed on the operating file and responsive to detecting the instruction. As mentioned above in the discussion of the rejection of claims 1-3, 9-12, 15 and 54-57, neither Dunphy nor Koshisaka, taken alone or in combination teach or suggest detection of an instruction *by an operating system*. In addition, neither Dunphy nor Koshisaka teach storing an archive file created from the operating file in a temporary first storage location responsive to detection of the operating system instruction. Koshisaka teaches that,

upon detection of only one of a delete command or a file rename command from the **application**, the deleted file name is stored and a corresponding back up file name is stored in memory. See Koshisaka, column 7, line 52 to column 9, line 43.

Unlike the method of claim 34, Dunphy **does not** detect an instruction **by an operating system**. Dunphy, much like Koshisaka and other references of record, is concerned with communications from the application programs themselves. As explained in detail in connection with the discussion of Koshisaka above, the present invention as defined by claim 34 performs file capture and file manipulation based on instructions from the operating system. This is a significant advance because it allows file capture before the file operation is performed, for example. Dunphy is limited to addressing files for which an operation that changes the file content is specified, e.g., a delete or modify operation. Dunphy would be useless against operations that do not intentionally change file content but that may corrupt file content such as file open operations or file rename operations.

It is apparent that the Office Action erred in its factual findings of the differences between the Dunphy/Koshisaka combination and the subject matter of claim 34. In view of this error, the Office Action failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to claims 34-38, 43 and 59.

i. **Claim 44**

With respect to claim 44, it requires that the archive file pass through two storage locations before ending up in permanent storage (its third storage location). The Office Action cites to column 4, lines 25-67 of Dunphy as teaching the method of claim 44. However, the cited portion of Dunphy does not provide such a teaching.

Lines 24-38 of Dunphy discuss creation of an event log 12. Event log 12 is not an archive file. Rather it is a collection of data that includes identifying information about a file. The closest thing that Dunphy teaches to an archive file is the data file saved in stash can 13. However, Dunphy does not teach or suggest moving that data file from stash can 13 to an intermediate storage location and subsequently to a permanent storage location as required by claim 44. Koshisaka provides no additional teaching that would have rendered the subject matter of claim 44 obvious to the skilled artisan.

It is apparent that the Office Action erred in its factual findings of the differences between the Dunphy/Koshisaka combination and the subject matter of claim 44. In view of this error, the Office Action failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to claims 44-51 and 58.

d. The Rejection of claims 4-8 and 13-14

The Office Action rejected claims 4-8 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Koshisaka in view of Dunphy. The grounds for this rejection are identical to rejection (a) of claims 1-3, 9-12, 15 and 54-57. Accordingly, Applicants incorporate by reference the arguments advanced in support of patentability above with respect to claims 1-3, 9-12, 15 and 54-57.

i. The Rejection of Claims 39-42

The Office Action rejected claims 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Dunphy in view of Koshisaka and further in view of Midgely et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,608,865 (hereinafter Midgely). This rejection is improper for the reasons set forth above as well as the following. The proposed combination of Dunphy, Koshisaka and

Midgely, does not teach all of the limitations of claims 39-42.

ii. Claims 39 and 40

Claim 39 calls for searching a first storage location for the archive file responsive to receipt of a message from a timer. Accordingly, the storage location is searched at some specified time interval. The Office Action recognizes that neither Koshisaka nor Dunphy teach searching a storage location for the archive file responsive to a message from a timer. The Office Action asserts that Midgely suggests notifying a user that a file change is about to be made via a message from a timer. Office Action, Page 18. Applicants submit that the Office Action's assertion about Midgely's teachings are completely unsupported. Nowhere does Midgely even remotely indicate to a person having ordinary skill in the art that a temporary file location is searched responsive to a message from a timer as required by claim 39. The Office Action references a passage of Midgely, specifically column 7, lines 59-63, but this passage has nothing to do with the relevant claim limitations. At best, Midgely teaches generating a notification when a user when a user requests a file open operation. It does not suggest the claimed operation of searching a temporary storage location responsive to any type of notification, whether that notification is a message from a timer as in claim 39 or a message from a resident program as in claim 40. Accordingly, the Office Actions failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claims 39 and 40 and the rejection of claims 39 and 40 must be reversed.

e. Claims 41 and 42

Regarding claims 41, it calls for moving the archive file to a permanent storage location responsive to a message from a timer. Claim 42 calls for moving the archive


file to a second storage location responsive to a message indicating when the second storage location is available. As recognized by the Office Action, neither Koshisaka nor Dunphy teach a method of archiving a file wherein archive files are moved to a second storage location responsive to receipt of a message. While the Office Action relied on Midgely for teaching that an agent is notified when a client requests a file open operation, prior to executing the open operation, Midgely offers no teaching that is remotely related to the limitations of claims 41 and 42. More particularly, Midgely does not teach moving an archive file responsive to a permanent storage location responsive to a timer message or a message indicating availability of the permanent storage location. Accordingly, the Office Action failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claims 41 and 42 and the rejection of claims 41 and 42 must be reversed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing arguments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-18 and 34-59 are allowable. Reversal of the rejections and allowance of all claims on appeal are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CAHN & SAMUELS, LLP

By: 

Frederick N. Samuels, Esq.

Reg. No. 34,715

2000 P Street, N.W. (Suite 200)

8. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. In a computing device, a method for archiving files comprising:
detecting an instruction by an operating system to perform an operation on an
operating file; and
capturing the operating file temporally proximate to the operation being performed
on the operating file, responsive to the detection of the instruction.

2. The method of claim 1 wherein capturing the operating file includes creating an
archive file and storing the archive file in a storage location.

3. The method of claim 2 wherein the archive file includes a copy of the operating
file.

4. The method of claim 2 wherein the archive file includes portions of the operating
file.

5. The method of claim 4 wherein the archive file includes pointers directed to one
or more storage locations, wherein each of the one or more storage locations contains
at least a portion of the operating file.

6. The method of claim 2 wherein capturing the file includes saving the archive file
prior to the operation being performed on the operating file.

7. The method of claim 2 wherein capturing the file includes saving the archive file
subsequent to detecting the instruction to perform the operation.

8. The method of claim 2 wherein capturing the file includes saving the archive file
subsequent to the operation being performed on the operating file.

9. The method of claim 2 wherein the storage location includes a buffer.
10. The method of claim 2 wherein the storage location includes a storage device.
11. The method of claim 10 wherein the storage device includes at least one of a group comprising a magnetic storage medium, an optical storage medium, and a solid-state storage device.
12. The method of claim 10 wherein the storage location includes a directory disposed on said storage device.
13. The method of claim 1 further comprising determining whether the operating file is intended to be captured prior to said capturing step.
14. The method of claim 1 further comprising determining whether the operating file has previously been captured prior to capturing the file.
15. The method of claim 1 further comprising determining whether the operation causes a change in the operating file.
16. An article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code for performing the method of claim 1.
17. A data transmission signal having computer readable program code for performing the method of claim 1.
18. An article of manufacture comprising a processor configured to perform the method of claim 1.

34. In a computing device, a method for archiving files comprising:

detecting an instruction by an operating system to perform an operation on an operating file;

creating an archive file from the operating file and storing the archive file in a temporary first storage location temporally proximate to the operation being performed on the operating file and responsive to detecting the instruction;

searching the first temporary storage location for the archive file responsive to the occurrence of a first event; and

moving the archive file to a second storage location responsive to a second event, the second storage location being a permanent storage location.

35. The method of claim 34 wherein storing the archive file includes storing the archive file prior to the operation being performed on the operating file.

36. The method of claim 34 wherein storing the archive file includes storing the archive file prior to the operation being performed on the operating file and subsequent to the operation being performed on the operating file.

37. The method of claim 34 wherein storing the archive file includes storing the archive file subsequent to the operation being performed on the operating file.

38. The method of claim 34 wherein the first temporary storage location includes a buffer.

39. The method of claim 34 wherein the first event includes a message from a timer.

40. The method of claim 34 wherein the first event includes a message from a program resident on the computing device.

41. The method of claim 34 wherein the second event includes a message from a timer.

42. The method of claim 34 wherein the second event includes a message indicating when the second storage location is available.

43. The method of claim 34 wherein the second storage location is an output buffer.

44. The method of claim 34 further comprising:

after storing the archive file in the first temporary storage location, updating a database to indicate that the archive file is located in the first temporary storage location;

determining a final destination for the archive file;

moving the archive file from the first temporary storage location to an intermediate storage location;

updating the database to indicate that the archive file is located in the intermediate storage location; and

after moving the archive file to the second storage location, updating the database to indicate that the archive file is located in the second storage location.

45. The method of claim 44 wherein the second storage location includes a personal attached storage device.

46. The method of claim 44 wherein the second storage location includes a network attached storage device.

47. The method of claim 44 wherein the second storage location includes a peer-to-peer storage device.

48. The method of claim 44 wherein the second storage location includes an Internet storage area network.

49. An article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code for performing the method of claim 44.

50. A data transmission signal having computer readable program code for performing the method of claim 44.

51. An article of manufacture comprising a processor configured to perform the method of claim 44.

52. The method of claim 2, wherein said capturing step occurs only if a match to a defined condition has been determined.

53. The method of claim 52, wherein said defined condition includes at least one of determining whether the operating file has previously been archived and determining whether the operating file has been selected for protection.

54. In a computing device, a method for archiving files, comprising:
detecting an instruction by an operating system to perform an operation on an operating file; and
capturing the operating file just before or just after the operation being performed on the operating file, responsive to the detection of the instruction.

55. The method of claim 54, wherein said capturing occurs an instant before or an instant after the operation is performed on the operating file.

56. The method of claim 54, wherein the operating file is a system file.

57. The method of claim 54, wherein the operating file is a user file.

58. The method of claim 34, wherein said first event is different from said second event.

59. In a computing device, a method for archiving files comprising:
detecting an instruction by an operating system to perform an operation on an operating file;
creating an archive file from the operating file and moving the archive file to a first storage device temporally proximate to the operation being performed on the operating file, responsive to detecting the instruction; and
storing the archive file in a second storage device.

10. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

EXHIBIT 1

Exhibit 1

WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD™

DICTIONARY of COMPUTER TERMS

EIGHTH EDITION

The Best Computer Dictionary in Print

Completely revised and updated

Contains extensive Internet coverage

More than 4,000 entries, terms, and acronyms

Bryan Pfaffenberger

THE NAME YOU TRUST

Dedication

For Suzanne, always

Webster's New World™ Dictionary of Computer Terms,
8th Edition

Copyright © 2000 by
IDG Books Worldwide, Inc.
An International Data Group Company
919 E. Hillsdale Blvd.
Suite 400
Foster City, CA 94404

All rights reserved including the right of reproduction in whole
or in part in any form.

For general information on IDG Books Worldwide's books in
the U.S., please call our Consumer Customer Service depart-
ment at 1-800-762-2974. For reseller information, including
discounts, bulk sales, customized editions, and premium sales,
please call our Reseller Customer Service department at
1-800-434-3422.

A Webster's New World™ Book

WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY is a registered
trademark of IDG Books Worldwide, Inc.

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 98-68180

ISBN: 0-02-863777-1

Manufactured in the United States of America

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 00 1 02 03 04

We
of c
sion

Th
are
ter
de
tio
ter

share

A file server utility for AppleTalk networks. transforms any Macintosh on the network into file server; the server's hard disk icon appears on work user's desktop.

A small- to medium-sized computer program that specific function, such as emulating a calculator. 2. In program embedded in a Web document that, when is executed by the browser. Both of the leading Netscape Communicator and Microsoft Internet can execute Java applets. See *Java applet* and *Java*

LocalTalk A local area network (LAN) standard developed by computer. AppleTalk can link as many as 32 Macintoshes, IBM PC-compatible computers, and peripherals aser printers. Every Macintosh computer has an LocalTalk port; the only hardware required for an AppleTalk is a set of LocalTalk connectors and ordinary telephone cables (called twisted-pair cable). AppleTalk networks are simple and inexpensive but quite slow; they are capable of tting only up to 230 Kbps. EtherTalk, in contrast, is of speeds of up to 10 million bps. See *EtherTalk*.

application A program that enables you to do something with the computer, such as writing or accounting posed to utilities, programs that help you maintain computer).

application Configuration Access Protocol (ACAP) Internet standard that transfers crucial user configuration settings (including address books, bookmarks, and options) to an Internet-accessible file. Because these settings are on the network instead of the user's computer, they are possible no matter which computer is being used. ACAP may benefit anyone who accesses the Internet from multiple computer.

application control menu See *control menu*.

application development system A coordinated set of development tools, typically including a full-screen programming language with a compiler, linker, and debugger.

and an extensive library of ready-to-use program modules. The use of an application development system lets experienced users develop a standalone application more easily than writing a program using a language such as C++ or COBOL.

application heap In a Macintosh, the base memory, the area of memory set aside for user programs.

application icon In Microsoft Windows 95/98, an onscreen graphic representation of a minimized program. The icon appears on the taskbar to remind you that the application is still present in memory. Double-click the application icon to switch to that program.

application layer In the Open System Interconnection (OSI) reference model of computer network architecture, the first or topmost of seven layers, in which the data is presented to the user. At this layer, protocols are needed to ensure that products made by different manufacturers can work together. For example, every e-mail program should use the same protocols for sending and receiving e-mail. When the data is ready to be sent to the network, it is passed down the protocol stack to the next layer, the presentation layer.

application-level encryption In a computer network, the implementation of encryption by individual applications rather than at the operating system or network level. Web browsers typically implement encryption at this level.

application program See *application*.

application/program interface (API) 1. A set of standards or conventions by which programs can call specific operating system or network services. 2. In Web servers, the standards or conventions that enable a hyperlink to originate a call to a program that is external to the server. See *CGI*, *ISAPI*, and *ASP*.

application shortcut key In Microsoft Windows, a shortcut key you assign to launch or bring an application to the foreground. Application shortcut keys are also available in application menus in FENIX view and PC Tools Desktop to launch and which run programs.

388 operand

operand The argument that is appended to an operator, such as a spreadsheet program's built-in function. For example, in the Excel expression AVERAGE(D10:D24), the cell range D10 to D24 is the operand of the AVERAGE function.

operating environment The total context in which applications function, including the operating system (OS) and the shell.

operating system (OS) A master control program that manages the computer's internal functions, such as accepting keyboard input, and that provides a means to control the computer's operations and file system.

operating voltage The electrical voltage at which a microprocessor operates. Most microprocessors have operating voltage of 5 volts—a mostly arbitrary specification decided upon when the transistor was invented—but some chips run at 3.3 volts to save electricity (a real concern in portable computers) and reduce heat output.

operator In programming, a code name or symbol that is used to describe a command or function, such as multiplying or dividing.

optical character recognition See OCR.

optical disk A large-capacity data storage medium for computers on which information is stored at extremely high density in the form of tiny pits. The presence or absence of pits is read by a tightly focused laser beam. CD-ROMs and CD-RW drives offer an increasingly economical medium for storing data and programs. Write-once, read-many (WORM) drives enable organizations to create their own huge, in-house data banks. Erasable optical disk drives offer more storage than hard disks, and the CDs are removable. However, they are still more expensive and much slower than hard disks. See *interactive video*.

optical fiber See *fiber optics*.

optical mouse A mouse that does not require a mechanical mouse does, but that must be used on a mouse pad. An optical mouse shines a beam of light in the mouse pad, which conveys the mouse's movement to the computer.

optical
scanner
more c
average
By me:
but soft
resoluti
optical
optima
spreadsh
tion by
last recal
optimiz
code intc
possible c
are virtua
microproc

option b
OR 1. I
expression
inter-datal
document

Oracle Ce
ditional d
enterprise c
SQL is its s

ORB: Acr
questing s
one cross-
module can
y needed f
nt of the
minimum t
ubuted o
dered list
ubuted list




Exhibit 2

RECEIVED FROM USPTO JULY 10, 2006 (TUE) SEP 17, 2004 12:00/ST:12:05/NO:6804631:068:PL2004

Atty. Docket No. 166.0001

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Roach et al.

Serial No. : 09/957,459

Examiner: To, Baoquoc N.

Filed : September 21, 2001

Group Art Unit: 2172

For : AN AUTOMATIC REAL-TIME FILE MANAGEMENT METHOD
AND APPARATUS

DECLARATION UNDER 37 CFR §1.132

I, Steven R. Williams, declare under penalty of perjury, that:

1. I am an electrical engineer and Vice President of precisionWave Corporation with approximately 23 years of experience in the software development industry. I make this declaration based upon my knowledge and years of experience.
2. I earned a Bachelor of Science degree in electrical engineering from the University of Illinois in 1981.
3. I am listed as a co-inventor on U.S. Patent Application No. 09/957,459.
4. I have reviewed U.S. Patent No. 6,629,109 B1, issued to Koshisaka (hereinafter "Koshisaka").
5. Koshisaka teaches "an application-centric" file revision management system for executing file revision management when an application operating on an operating system of a computer system saves a file by file overwrite. The file manipulation monitoring section monitors and hooks Application Program Interface (API) commands outputted by the application to the operating system, thereby detecting file manipulation executed by the application. After a command is hooked, a different instruction is passed to the operating system in order to carry out Koshisaka's revision management system activities. See Koshisaka, column 6, lines 32-43.

6. As illustrated by EXHIBIT A, a diagram of a likely implementation of the Koshisaka file revision management system, the system of Koshisaka includes an application 105 that is written for the Koshisaka API, a Koshisaka-specific API 110, an

operating system 115, and a group of user files 120. As Koshisaka is an application-centric system, the file manipulation monitoring section of Koshisaka detects an instruction 125 (for example, a file deletion instruction) which is going to be outputted by the application. Koshisaka does not operate by detecting an instruction by an operating system. See Koshisaka, column 6, lines 32-43. Thus, Koshisaka fails to teach or suggest at least the "detecting an instruction by an operating system" limitation of the claims. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the above-referenced invention was made to modify the teachings of Koshisaka to obtain the above-referenced invention.

7. An alternative implementation of Koshisaka includes an application that is NOT written for a Koshisaka-specific API, but is written to output instructions directly to an operating system via the normal Windows API. Koshisaka suggests the possibility of monitoring such outputted instructions from the application to the operating system, and supplanting these operating system instructions with different operating system instructions in order to carry out Koshisaka's revision management activities. Even in this alternative implementation, Koshisaka cannot be interpreted to teach or suggest at least the "detecting an instruction by an operating system" limitation of the claims. As in item 6 above, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the above-referenced invention was made to modify the teachings of Koshisaka to obtain the above-referenced invention.

8. As a result of detecting the instruction by the application, unlike the invention disclosed in the above-referenced application, Koshisaka provides a very limited layer of file protection.

9. I have reviewed U.S. Patent No. 6,535,894, issued to Schmidt *et al.* (hereinafter "Schmidt").


10. Schmidt discloses an apparatus and method for incremental updating of archive files. An original archive file having one or more entries is created, where each entry in the original archive file is itself a file. The original archive file is transmitted to a client computer, and subsequently, a target archive file is created wherein one or more of its entries are "typically expected" to be identical to one or more entries in the original archive file. A difference file including an index file describing the changes between the

original archive file and the target archive file is also created and transmitted to the client computer. At the client computer, Schmidt teaches that the difference archive file is applied to the original archive file to produce a synthesized archive file. See Schmidt, column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 59.


11. Schmidt's field of invention relates to an apparatus and method to facilitate incremental updating of program code. See Schmidt, column 1, lines 8-14. Schmidt discloses methods for optimizing transmitted archive files through the creation and manipulation of original archive files, target archive files, difference archive files and synthesized archive files. Schmidt teaches improvements to the deployment of program code from server computers to client computers.

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

Executed this 17th day of September 2004.



Steven R. Williams



11. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

NONE

60 of 83 DOCUMENTS

Ex parte THOMAS E. MITCHELL and WILLIAM LEE ROBERTS

Appeal No. 2002-1798

Application 09/238,804 n1

n1 Application for patent filed January 28, 1999, entitled "Violation Alert Speed Display," which is a continuation of Application 08/933,152, filed September 18, 1997, now U.S. Patent 6,046,686, issued April 4, 2000.

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

2001 Pat. App. LEXIS 66

August 9, 2001, Decided

[*1]

Before BARRETT, RUGGIERO, and SAADAT, Administrative Patent Judges.

OPINIONBY: BARRETT

OPINION:

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

ON BRIEF

BARRETT, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the final rejection of claims 26-35.

We reverse and remand.

BACKGROUND

The invention relates to a vehicle speed measuring and display device that displays an approaching vehicle's speed on a digital display at a subdued, steady state when the speed is under the legal speed limit and at a highly visible, warning state when the speed is above the legal speed limit. The warning state may be provided by flashing or an accentuating color. n2

n2 It is noted that many companies manufacture radar speed monitors with a speed alarm option that flashes the speed when the speed limit is exceeded, e.g., MPH Industries (www.mphindustries.com/products_home/monitor_trailers2.html), Traffic Display Monitor Co. (1-radar-speed-trailer-display.com/feature.htm), McCoy's Lawline (www.policeradar.com/RadarTrailer2.htm). These were found with a Google search using "radar speed displays." However, the date these devices were first made is unknown and appellants have an effective filing date of September 18, 1997. Since it is known that many commercial devices will infringe any patent that may issue on this application, it is in the best interests of both the public and appellants to have the best possible rejection made in the first instance.

[*2]

Claim 31 is reproduced below.

31. A vehicle speed measuring and display device comprising:

a mobile display structure adapted to be positioned at a roadside location where it can be seen by a driver of an approaching vehicle,

means for providing a signal indicative of the actual speed of a vehicle approaching said structure,

means on said structure responsive to said signal for displaying said vehicle's speed in a digital form, said display means having electrically responsive indicia for displaying at least two numeric digits,

means for comparing said signal with a selected threshold speed that is related to the legal speed limit for the road by which the vehicle's speed is to be displayed, and

means responsive to said comparing means for energizing said indicia in a subdued, steady state in the digits corresponding to the vehicle's speed when the vehicle's speed is below said threshold speed, and energizing said indicia in a highly visible, warning state in the digits corresponding to the vehicle's speed when the vehicle's speed is above said threshold speed.

The examiner relies on the following references:

McClellan, Sr. et al. (McClellan)	3,691,525	September 12, 1972
Strickland	5,231,393	July 27, 1993
Haeri	5,659,290	August 19, 1997
[*3]		

Claims 26, 27, 31, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strickland and Haeri.

Claims 28-30 and 33-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strickland and Haeri, further in view of McClellan.

OPINION

Appellants argue that the obviousness rejection cannot stand because the examiner did not address the objective evidence of nonobviousness (Brief, pp. 28-31; Reply Brief, pp. 8-9).

Objective evidence (also called "secondary considerations") is one of the four mandatory factual inquiries under *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (1966) and must always be considered, when present and timely presented, as part of the obviousness determination, *Stratoflex Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 1538-39, 218 USPQ 871, 879 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The existence of objective evidence need not be conclusive. *Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.*, 776 F.2d 281, 306, 227 USPQ 657, 674 (Fed. Cir. 1985). [*4]

Appellants submitted a report by Speed Measurement Laboratories, Inc. (SML) dated July 11, 2000, in the Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 (Paper No. 11) received October 2, 2000. In the Advisory Action (Paper No. 13) entered November 7, 2000, the examiner merely checked the box stating that "The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:" and filled in the blank that "The examiner still believes that the independent claims 26 and 31, as stands, are not patentably distinguished over the obviousness rejection as taught by Strickland in view of Haeri." The examiner did not provide a written explanation addressing the merits of the SML report as part of the obviousness analysis. Appellants also filed a Declaration of Steven F. Hocker Under 37 CFR § 1.132, with an attached Exhibit 1 showing a brochure of a speed monitoring awareness trailer manufactured and sold by Kustom, the assignee of the present invention, under the trademark SMART, and an attached Exhibit 2 showing a sample quotation showing a price of \$ 250 for the violator alert feature (Paper No. 17), received May 7, 2001, with a discussion [*5] of this evidence (Paper No. 16), received May 7, 2001. In the next Advisory Action (Paper No. 18) entered June 4, 2001, the examiner checked the boxes that "The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:" and filled in the blank that "The claims, as stands, are not patentably distinguished over the obviousness rejection as taught [by] Strickland (US 5,231,393) in view of Haeri (US 5,659,290)." The examiner did not provide a written explanation addressing the merits of the Hocker declaration or the earlier SML report as part of the obviousness analysis.

Thus, appellants timely submitted objective evidence of nonobviousness, which was apparently considered by the examiner. However, there is absolutely no written discussion of the objective evidence in the record and, in particular, absolutely no written discussion in the examiner's answer. The examiner's answer is conspicuously silent in response to appellants' arguments that the objective evidence was not addressed. Since objective evidence must always be considered as part of the obviousness analysis when timely filed, the examiner has failed to perform a [*6] complete Graham v. John Deere analysis. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 26-35 are reversed and the case is remanded for the examiner to provide a written analysis of the objective evidence of nonobviousness. n3

n3 We reverse to make it clear that appellants may be entitled to a term adjustment in any patent which may issue. We remand so that the examiner need not seek permission of the Director to reopen prosecution under 37 CFR § 1.198.

In addition, since the examiner must reopen prosecution to consider the objective evidence of nonobviousness, we take this opportunity to point out better prior art that should be added to the rejection in the interest of presenting the best possible case (see footnote 2). First, the reference to Carey et al. (Carey), U.S. Patent 3,544,958, cited by appellants in the background of the invention (specification, p. 1), shows a roadside speed display sign having a digital speed display 22. When the measured speed is above the legal limit, red warning sign 26, which reads "Your Speed Is," red warning sign 23, which reads "Slow Down," and warning light 25 will be lit in addition to the speed indicator 22; when the measured speed is [*7] below the legal limit, green approval sign 27, which reads "Your Speed Is," and green approval sign 24, which reads "Safe Drivers Live," are lit in addition to the speed indicator 22 (col. 3, lines 9-50). Thus, Carey teaches using different colors to indicate speeds above and below the speed limit, albeit not of the indicator digits themselves. It is not known why the examiner did not rely on Carey. Second, Strickland describes Clegg, U.S. Patent 3,054,087, in the background of the invention, as a traffic warning system where Figs. 2A and 2B "have indicia that light up when the predetermined speed is exceeded" (col. 2, lines 10-11). Thus, Strickland teaches providing a visual indication when a speed limit is exceeded, which provides motivation for providing specific visual indications. The examiner did not mention or rely on this part of Strickland in the rejection. Third, Clegg teaches that the speeding light indicator can be steady state or flashing (col. 2, lines 24-25) and that the word "Exceeding" in a different color than the rest of the sign can be illuminated to indicate speeding (col. 3, lines 8-43). Thus, Clegg teaches a flashing light to indicate speeding. The addition [*8] of Carey and Clegg to the rejection would strengthen the rejection and simplify the arguments. It also seems that Carey is a much better reference than McClellan.

CONCLUSION

The rejections of claims 26-35 are reversed and the application is remanded to the examiner for consideration of the objective evidence of nonobviousness and such further action as may be appropriate in view of our comments.

REVERSED AND REMANDED

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record.**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

BLACK BORDERS

IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES

FADED TEXT OR DRAWING

BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING

SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES

COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS

GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY

OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.